REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ben-David et al (WO 01/95544, hereinafter referred to as Ben-David).

Response:

Independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended to overcome these rejections. Claims 1 and 6 now each recite that a scalar controls the image modulator to create a plurality of gray-level images for each of one or more predetermined colors. In addition, a control circuit projects an on screen display (OSD) on a screen, where the OSD comprises the plurality of gray-level images created by the scalar. The control circuit is also used for adjusting a color wheel delay of the projector until the gray-level images corresponding to each color display the proper color on the OSD, thereby synchronizing the color wheel with the image modulator.

Support for these amendments is found in the original claim 7 along with paragraphs [0018] and [0019] of the specification. No new matter is added through these amendments to claims 1 and 6.

On the other hand, neither Ben-David nor Conner et al. (US 5,625,424, hereafter referred to as "Conner") teach adjusting a color wheel delay of a projector using gray-level images projected on a screen through an OSD. As noted by the Examiner on page 6 of the Office action dated 12/19/2006, Ben-David does not teach displaying an OSD for adjusting a color wheel delay on a screen. Conner teaches in column 2, lines 38-47 that a color wheel motor controller 17 is used for adjusting both the speed and the phase of a color wheel motor 16. However, Conner does not teach the use of an OSD for performing the color wheel delay adjustment,

and only says that the motor controller 17 can be adjusted.

The Applicant respectfully submits that it is not obvious from the teachings of Ben-David and Conner to use an OSD to synchronize the color wheel with the image modulator by adjusting the color wheel delay of the projector until the gray-level images corresponding to each color display the proper color on the OSD. Neither Ben-David nor Conner teach displaying an OSD containing gray-level images, and therefore one skilled in the art would not be motivated to produce the claimed invention as recited in claims 1 and 6 from reading the disclosures of the cited prior art. Claims 1 and 6 are thus patentable over the combination of Ben-David and Conner.

Furthermore, claims 2-5 and 8-11 are dependent on claims 1 and 6, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-6 and 8-11 is therefore respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-David in view of Conner.

Response:

Claim 7 is cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration.

In view of the claim amendments and the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

/Winston Hsu/ Date: 03/12/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)